

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
WESTERN DIVISION - CINCINNATI**

JAMIE WILLIAMS,	:	Case No. 1:22-cv-469
	:	
Plaintiff,	:	
	:	Judge Matthew W. McFarland
v.	:	
	:	
YOUR HONORABLE JUDGE TOM	:	
HEEKIN,	:	
	:	
Defendant.	:	

ORDER ADOPTING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION (Doc. 4)

This action is before the Court upon the Report and Recommendation (the “Report”) (Doc. 4) of United States Magistrate Judge Elizabeth P. Deavers, to whom this case is referred pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b). In the Report, Magistrate Judge Deavers recommends that this Court dismiss Plaintiff’s Complaint, in its entirety, with prejudice. (See Doc. 4.) Plaintiff submitted timely objections (Doc. 12). Thus, the matter is ripe for the Court’s review.

The Court finds that Plaintiff’s objections do not present any new arguments that were not otherwise set forth in his Complaint. The allegations within the Complaint were thoroughly and properly addressed and rejected by Magistrate Judge Deavers. These general objections are not sufficient to preserve any issues for review, as rehashing the same arguments made previously defeats the purpose and efficiency of the Federal Magistrate’s Act, 28 U.S.C. § 636. *Gilmore v. Russian*, No. 2:16-cv-1133, 2017 WL 2633524, at *1 (S.D. Ohio June 19, 2017) (citing *Howard v. Sec’y of Health & Human Servs.*, 932 F.2d

505, 509 (6th Cir. 1991) (“A general objection to the entirety of the magistrate’s report has the same effect as would a failure to objection.”).


The claims brought by Plaintiff against Judge Tom Heekin are barred by judicial immunity. *See Bush v. Rauch*, 38 F.3d 842, 847 (6th Cir. 1994). Plaintiff, in his objections, failed to present any argument to show that Judge Heekin’s actions were not protected. Plaintiff otherwise fails to demonstrate any factual or legal error by Magistrate Judge Deavers in her review.

As required by 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 72(b), the Court has made a de novo review of the record in this case. Upon said review, the Court finds that Plaintiff’s Objections are not well-taken and are accordingly **OVERRULED**. Thus, the Court **ADOPTS** Magistrate Judge Deaver’s Report and Recommendation (Doc. 4) in its entirety. The Court **ORDERS** the following:

- (1) This action is **DISMISSED** with prejudice, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915A(b).
- (2) The Court **CERTIFIES**, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a), that any appeal of this Order would not be taken in good faith and that Plaintiff should be denied leave to appeal *in forma pauperis*.
- (3) This matter is hereby **TERMINATED** from the Court’s docket.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO

By: 
MATTHEW W. McFARLAND
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE